

The Projected Newton Method  
Has Order  $1 + \sqrt{2}$  for the  
Symmetric Eigenvalue Problem

by

R.A. Tapia

and

David L. Whitley

Technical Report 87-14, May 1987  
(Revised November 1987)

<b>Report Documentation Page</b>			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>		
<p>Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p>					
1. REPORT DATE <b>NOV 1987</b>	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-1987 to 00-00-1987</b>			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>The Projected Newton Method Has Order 1 +Square Root of 2 for the Symmetric Eigenvalue Problem</b>			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Computational and Applied Mathematics Department ,Rice University,6100 Main Street MS 134,Houston,TX,77005-1892</b>			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>13</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

# The Projected Newton Method Has Order $1 + \sqrt{2}$ for the Symmetric Eigenvalue Problem

R.A. Tapia\*      David L. Whitley\*

## Abstract

In their study of the classical inverse iteration algorithm, Peters and Wilkinson considered the closely related algorithm that consists of applying Newton's method, followed by a 2-norm normalization, to the nonlinear system of equations consisting of the eigenvalue-eigenvector equation and an equation requiring the eigenvector to have the square of its 2-norm equal to one. They argue that in practice the  $\infty$ -norm is easier to work with, and they therefore replace the 2-norm normalization equation with a linear equation requiring that a particular component of the eigenvector be equal to one (effectively an  $\infty$ -norm normalization). Next, they observe that, because of the linearity of the normalization equation, the normalization step is automatically satisfied; the algorithm thus reduces to Newton's method and quadratic convergence follows from standard theory. Peters and Wilkinson choose to dismiss the 2-norm formulation in favor of the  $\infty$ -norm formulation; one factor in their choice seems to be that quadratic convergence is not so immediate for the 2-norm formulation. In this work we establish the surprising result that the 2-norm formulation gives a convergence rate of  $1 + \sqrt{2}$ , significantly superior to that given by the Peters and Wilkinson formulation.

---

\*Mathematical Sciences Department, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77251-1892. Research sponsored by DOE DE-FG05-86ER25017, SDIO/IST managed under ARO DAAG-03-86-K-0113, and AFOSR 85-0243.

# 1 Introduction

In their study of the classical inverse iteration algorithm, Peters and Wilkinson (1979) considered two closely related algorithms. They began by observing that in finding an eigenvector-eigenvalue pair  $(x_*, \lambda_*)$  of a given real symmetric matrix  $A$ , if we require that  $\|x\|_2 = 1$ , then the pair must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (A - \lambda I)x &= 0, \\ \frac{1}{2}(1 - x^T x) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

They then suggest the following scheme for solving this system: let  $x_0^T x_0 = 1$  for the initial iterate  $(x_0, \lambda_0)$ ; now given a current iterate  $(x, \lambda)$ , let  $(\Delta x, \Delta \lambda)$  solve

$$\begin{pmatrix} A - \lambda I & -x \\ -x^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta \lambda \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} (A - \lambda I)x \\ \frac{1}{2}(1 - x^T x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} x_+ &= \frac{(x + \Delta x)}{\|x + \Delta x\|}, \\ \lambda_+ &= \lambda + \Delta \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Without the normalization in (3) this would be Newton's method applied to the nonlinear system (1). With the normalization it is the Projected Newton Method.

Motivated by the fact that in practice it is usually simpler to scale successive  $x$ -iterates so that a particular component is equal to one, Peters and Wilkinson propose using a different normalization: instead of finding a solution to (1), find one to

$$\begin{aligned} (A - \lambda I)x &= 0, \\ 1 - e_m^T x &= 0; \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where it is assumed that the  $m$ th component of  $x_*$  is one of its larger components. The analogous iterative scheme for solving this problem requires that  $e_m^T x_0 = 1$ , and that  $(\Delta x, \Delta \lambda)$  solve

$$\begin{pmatrix} A - \lambda I & -x \\ -e_m^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta \lambda \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} (A - \lambda I)x \\ 1 - e_m^T x \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Here, we take

$$\begin{aligned} x_+ &= x + \Delta x, \\ \lambda_+ &= \lambda + \Delta \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Because  $e_m^T(\Delta x) = 0$ , each iterate satisfies the new normalization; therefore, Projected Newton coincides with Newton's method on the system (4). In Section 4 of Peters and Wilkinson (1979), there is an argument that establishes that the matrix in Equation (5) is nonsingular at  $(x_*, \lambda_*)$  if  $\lambda_*$  is a simple eigenvalue. Thus, when  $\lambda_*$  is a simple eigenvalue, the convergence of this scheme is clearly q-quadratic in the pair  $(x, \lambda)$ , as a consequence of the standard theory for Newton's Method.

Wilkinson (1981) considered extensions, refinements or applications of the scheme (6), as did Dongarra, Moler and Wilkinson (1983). The latter paper also contains a proof of r-quadratic convergence of the  $x$ -iterates for this scheme, which follows immediately from the q-quadratic convergence of the pair  $(x, \lambda)$  (The definitions of r- and q-order of convergence may be found in Dennis and Schnabel (1983), pp. 19-21. For further detail, see Chapter 9 of Ortega and Rheinboldt (1970)). In numerical experiments to assess the behavior of the two schemes described, we discovered that the second did indeed seem to be q-quadratically convergent, but no better; the first, however, was undeniably faster than q-quadratic, yet not q-cubic. In §2 we prove our main result, that the convergence of *each* of the sequences  $x_k$  and  $\lambda_k$  generated by the first scheme is actually of q-order  $1 + \sqrt{2}$ . In §3, we add concluding remarks.

Before proceeding to the main result, we note that the two algorithms presented above are closely related to two other well-known methods for finding an eigenvalue-eigenvector pair for a symmetric matrix  $A$ : inverse iteration and Rayleigh Quotient Iteration. To see this, note that the first equation in either (2) or (5) implies that

$$(A - \lambda I)\hat{x}_+ = (A - \lambda I)(x + \Delta x) = (\Delta \lambda)x. \quad (7)$$

Given a current eigenvector estimate  $x$  and eigenvalue estimate  $\lambda$  (for inverse iteration the eigenvalue estimate is fixed, for the other three it changes from iteration to iteration), equation (7) shows that each of the latter three methods produces a new eigenvector estimate that is a scalar multiple of

the one given by inverse iteration. The new eigenvalue estimates for these three methods are also related to each other in an interesting way. By premultiplying both sides of (2) by  $(x^T, -\lambda)$  and rearranging terms, we obtain the expression

$$\lambda_+ = \frac{x^T A x_+}{x^T x_+} \quad (8)$$

for the Projected Newton formulation. Similarly, we can obtain from (5) the expression

$$\lambda_+ = \frac{e_m^T A x_+}{e_m^T x_+}$$

for the Peters-Wilkinson formulation. For the Rayleigh Quotient Iteration, the new eigenvalue estimate is given by

$$\lambda_+ = \frac{x_+^T A x_+}{x_+^T x_+}.$$

Thus each method has the effect of solving  $(A - \lambda I)\hat{x}_+ = x$ , scaling appropriately, and updating  $\lambda$  using the appropriate formula. This shows that our result is of a theoretical nature, since it offers few if any real computational advantages over the Rayleigh Quotient Iteration, the convergence of which is q-cubic.

## 2 Main result

The following Lemma gives a sufficient condition for a q-convergence rate of  $1 + \sqrt{2}$ .

**Lemma** *Let  $\{x_k\}$  be a sequence that converges to  $x_*$ . If there exist positive constants  $m$ ,  $M$ , and  $\hat{k}$  such that*

$$m \leq \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{\|x_k - x_*\|^2 \|x_{k-1} - x_*\|} \leq M \quad (9)$$

*for all  $k \geq \hat{k}$ , then  $x_k$  converges to  $x_*$  with q-order  $1 + \sqrt{2}$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly, we can assume  $\hat{k} = 1$  without loss of generality. If we define  $\alpha_k$  by

$$\alpha_k = \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{\|x_k - x_*\|^{1+\sqrt{2}}},$$

then we can rewrite (9) as

$$m \leq \alpha_{k+1} \alpha_k^{\sqrt{2}-1} \leq M.$$

This pair of inequalities can be applied repeatedly to yield

$$m \alpha_1^{-(\sqrt{2}-1)} \leq \alpha_2 \leq M \alpha_1^{-(\sqrt{2}-1)},$$

$$m M^{-(\sqrt{2}-1)} \alpha_1^{(\sqrt{2}-1)^2} \leq \alpha_3 \leq M m^{-(\sqrt{2}-1)} \alpha_1^{(\sqrt{2}-1)^2},$$

and so on (as can be shown by induction); in general,

$$\alpha_k \leq M m^{-(\sqrt{2}-1)} M^{(\sqrt{2}-1)^2} m^{-(\sqrt{2}-1)^3} \dots \alpha_1^{(-(\sqrt{2}-1))^{k-1}} \equiv \beta_k.$$

Therefore,  $\limsup \alpha_k \leq \lim \beta_k = M^{(\frac{1}{2(\sqrt{2}-1)})} m^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Hence for all sufficiently large  $k$ ,

$$\frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{\|x_k - x_*\|^{1+\sqrt{2}}} = \alpha_k < M^{(\frac{1}{2(\sqrt{2}-1)})} m^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1.$$

Therefore  $x_k$  converges to  $x_*$  with q-order  $1 + \sqrt{2}$ .  $\square$

From now on, let us write  $(x_-, \lambda_-)$ ,  $(x, \lambda)$ , and  $(x_+, \lambda_+)$ , where convenient, in place of  $(x_{k-1}, \lambda_{k-1})$ ,  $(x_k, \lambda_k)$ , and  $(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})$ . We now state our main result:

**Theorem** *Let  $A$  be a symmetric matrix,  $x_0$  a vector with  $\|x_0\| = 1$ , and  $\lambda_0$  a scalar that is not an eigenvalue of  $A$ . Taking  $(x, \lambda) = (x_0, \lambda_0)$  initially, apply the following steps iteratively to generate a sequence  $(x_k, \lambda_k)$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{x}_+ \\ \lambda_+ \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} A - \lambda I & -x \\ -x^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} (A - \lambda I)x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ x_+ &= \frac{\hat{x}_+}{\|\hat{x}_+\|}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\lambda_k$  converges to an eigenvalue  $\lambda_*$  and  $\lambda_k \neq \lambda_*$  for all  $k$ , then  $\lambda_k$  converges with  $q$ -order  $1 + \sqrt{2}$ , and  $x_k$  converges with the same  $q$ -order to a corresponding eigenvector  $x_*$ .

*Remark.* We note that neither the hypothesis requiring convergence of  $\lambda_k$  nor the hypothesis that  $\lambda_k \neq \lambda_*$  should be considered restrictive. When  $\lambda_*$  is a simple eigenvalue, the Jacobian matrix is nonsingular at  $(x_*, \lambda_*)$ , so the standard theory for Newton's method ensures that the sequence is locally quadratically convergent (at least) in this case. When  $\lambda_*$  is not simple, convergence does not follow from the standard theory, but in view of this algorithm's resemblance to inverse iteration, it is reasonable to assume that  $x_k$  will converge to an eigenvector, and Equation (8) then implies that  $\lambda_k$  converges to an eigenvalue. The second hypothesis excludes the possibility that a finite number of iterations might lead to an exact solution. If  $x_k$  were an eigenvector, then  $\lambda_{k+1}$  would be the corresponding eigenvalue, as can be readily seen from (8). If  $\lambda_k$  were equal to an eigenvalue, then the iteration as described above might not be defined, since the matrix might be singular; in any case, however,  $(\Delta x, \Delta \lambda) = (\hat{x}_* - x, 0)$  would solve the associated linear system (2) for some eigenvector  $\hat{x}_*$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$ . Thus an exact solution would be found in one more iteration, provided that the iteration is defined.

*Proof.* There are two main parts to the proof of the Theorem: we show first that

$$l_1 \leq \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \|x_k - x_*\|} \leq u_1 \quad (10)$$

and then that

$$l_2 \leq \frac{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*|}{\|x_k - x_*\| \|x_{k-1} - x_*\|} \leq u_2, \quad (11)$$

for  $k$  sufficiently large, where  $l_1, u_1, l_2$ , and  $u_2$  are positive constants. From (10) and (11), it is straightforward to show that

$$l_1 l_2 \leq \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{\|x_k - x_*\|^2 \|x_{k-1} - x_*\|} \leq u_1 u_2,$$

and

$$\frac{l_1^2 l_2}{u_2} \leq \frac{|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_*|}{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*|^2 |\lambda_{k-1} - \lambda_*|} \leq \frac{u_1^2 u_2}{l_2}.$$

We can then apply the Lemma to conclude that both  $x_k$  and  $\lambda_k$  converge with q-order  $1 + \sqrt{2}$  whenever (10) and (11) hold.

For the first part of the proof, we parallel the proof of the linear convergence of the power method given by Parlett (1980). We begin with some notation: let  $S$  be the subspace of eigenvectors of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_*$ , and denote the orthogonal complement of  $S$  by  $S^\perp$ . Define  $x_*$  to be the vector obtained by normalizing the projection of  $x_0$  onto the subspace  $S$ . Denote the angle between  $x$  and  $x_*$  by  $\theta$ , and the angle between  $x_+$  and  $x_*$  by  $\theta_+$ . Note that we can write  $x$  as

$$x = x_* \cos \theta + u \sin \theta, \quad (12)$$

where  $u$  is a unit vector orthogonal to  $x_*$ . If we pre-multiply both sides of (12) by  $(A - \lambda I)^{-1}$ , we obtain

$$(A - \lambda I)^{-1} x = x_* \left( \frac{\cos \theta}{\lambda_* - \lambda} \right) + \left( \frac{(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u}{\|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\|} \right) (\|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\| \sin \theta).$$

By (7),  $(A - \lambda I)^{-1} x$  is a scalar multiple of  $x_+$ ; since  $x_*$  is orthogonal to  $(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u$ , the above expression shows that an orthogonal decomposition of  $x_+$  is

$$x_+ = x_* \cos \theta_+ + u_+ \sin \theta_+,$$

where

$$u_+ = \frac{(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u}{\|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\|} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tan \theta_+ &= \frac{\|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\| \sin \theta}{\cos \theta / (\lambda_* - \lambda)} \\ &= (\lambda_* - \lambda) \|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\| \tan \theta. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of  $x_*$ ,  $u_0 \in S^\perp$ ; hence, by Equation (13) and induction, we can conclude that  $u_k \in S^\perp$  for all  $k$ . Thus we can obtain upper and lower bounds on  $\|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\|$  by considering the restriction of  $(A - \lambda I)^{-1}$  to  $S^\perp$  (i.e. the reduced resolvent), which we denote by  $(A - \lambda I)^{-\perp}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|(A - \lambda I)^{-1} u\| &= \|(A - \lambda I)^{-\perp} u\| \\ &\leq \|(A - \lambda I)^{-\perp}\| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\nu_\lambda - \lambda|}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $\nu_\lambda$  is the nearest eigenvalue of  $A$  to  $\lambda$  other than  $\lambda_*$ . Similarly,

$$\|(A - \lambda I)^{-1}u\| \geq \frac{1}{|\phi_\lambda - \lambda|} \quad (15)$$

where  $\phi_\lambda$  is the eigenvalue of  $A$  farthest from  $\lambda$ . So we now have that

$$\left| \frac{\lambda_* - \lambda}{\phi_\lambda - \lambda} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\tan \theta_+}{\tan \theta} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\lambda_* - \lambda}{\nu_\lambda - \lambda} \right|. \quad (16)$$

It is clear from (16) that if  $\lambda_k$  converges to  $\lambda_*$ , then the vector we have defined to be  $x_*$  is indeed the eigenvector to which  $x_k$  converges.

In terms of the error angle  $\theta$ , the error in  $x$  is given by

$$\|x - x_*\| = 2 \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \quad (17)$$

$$= \sqrt{2(1 - \cos \theta)}. \quad (18)$$

From (18), the following relationship can be derived in a straightforward manner:

$$\frac{\|x_+ - x_*\|}{\|x - x_*\|} = \left| \frac{\tan \theta_+}{\tan \theta} \right| \left| \frac{\cos \theta_+}{\cos \theta} \right| \left( \frac{1 + \cos \theta}{1 + \cos \theta_+} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (19)$$

Combining (16) with (19) and taking limits, we may conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\phi_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|} &\leq \liminf \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \|x_k - x_*\|} \\ &\leq \limsup \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|}{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \|x_k - x_*\|} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\nu_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (10) holds with, for instance,  $l_1 = \frac{1}{2|\phi_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|}$  and  $u_1 = \frac{2}{|\nu_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|}$ .

We now show that there exist positive  $l_2$  and  $u_2$  satisfying (11). We first use (8) to write

$$\lambda - \lambda_* = \frac{x_-^T (A - \lambda_* I) x}{x_-^T x}. \quad (20)$$

If we substitute the orthogonal decompositions of  $x_-$  and  $x$  given by (12) into (20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda - \lambda_* &= \frac{(x_* \cos \theta_- + u_- \sin \theta_-)^T (A - \lambda_* I) (x_* \cos \theta + u \sin \theta)}{x_-^T x} \\ &= \frac{(u_- \sin \theta_-)^T (A - \lambda_* I) (u \sin \theta)}{x_-^T x},\end{aligned}$$

since  $(x_*, \lambda_*)$  is an eigenvector-eigenvalue pair for  $A$ . Now we use (17) to relate the sines of the error angles to the sizes of the errors in  $x_-$  and  $x$ , and we use (13) to write  $u$  in terms of  $u_-$  and  $\lambda_-$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\lambda - \lambda_*}{\|x_- - x_*\| \|x - x_*\|} &= \frac{\cos \frac{\theta_-}{2} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} (u_-^T (A - \lambda_- I) u + (\lambda_- - \lambda_*) u_-^T u)}{x_-^T x} \\ &= \frac{\cos \frac{\theta_-}{2} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}}{x_-^T x} \left( \frac{1}{\|(A - \lambda_- I)^{-1} u_-\|} + (\lambda_- - \lambda_*) u_-^T u \right).\end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds for  $\|(A - \lambda_- I)^{-1} u_-\|$  from (14) and (15), then taking limits, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|\phi_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|} &\leq \liminf \frac{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*|}{\|x_k - x_*\| \|x_{k-1} - x_*\|} \\ &\leq \limsup \frac{|\lambda_k - \lambda_*|}{\|x_k - x_*\| \|x_{k-1} - x_*\|} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\nu_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence (11) holds with, for example,  $l_2 = \frac{1}{2|\phi_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|}$  and  $u_2 = \frac{2}{|\nu_{\lambda_*} - \lambda_*|}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Conclusion

The motivation for this work was the intriguing and, to us, surprising non-integral superquadratic convergence rate indicated in our numerical experiments. We were also quite pleased that we were able to establish a q-rate

of convergence of  $1 + \sqrt{2}$  both for the  $x$ -iterate alone and for the  $\lambda$ -iterate alone. The classical Newton's method theory gives  $q$ -quadratic convergence in the pair  $(x, \lambda)$  for the Peters-Wilkinson algorithm, which implies an  $r$ -quadratic rate in each of  $x$  and  $\lambda$ . The direct proof given by Dongarra, Moler and Wilkinson (1983) also only establishes  $r$ -quadratic convergence in  $x$  for the same algorithm.

We experimented with several problem formulations that used  $p$ -norms other than the 2-norm and  $\infty$ -norm; for no values of  $p$  except  $p = 2$  did our estimated convergence rates consistently exceed 2. On the basis of these experiments, we consider it extremely unlikely that any  $p$ -norm formulation other than the one presented here produces superquadratic convergence.

## REFERENCES

Dennis, J.E., Jr., and Robert B. Schnabel (1983). *Numerical Methods for Nonlinear Equations and Unconstrained Optimization*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Dongarra, J.J., C.B. Moler and J.H. Wilkinson (1981). Improving the accuracy of computed eigenvalues and eigenvectors, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 20, pp. 23–45.

Ortega, J.M., and W.C. Rheinboldt (1970), *Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables*, Academic Press, New York.

Parlett, Beresford N. (1980). *The Symmetric Eigenvalue Problem*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Peters, G. and J.H. Wilkinson (1979). Inverse iteration, ill-conditioned equations and Newton's method, SIAM Review, 21, pp. 339–360.

Wilkinson, J.H. (1962). Inverse iteration in theory and practice, in: *Symposia Mathematica Volume X* (Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica Monograf, Bologna, 1972) pp. 361-379.

Wilkinson, J.H. (1981). Error bounds for computed invariant subspaces, Proc. of Rutishauser Symposium on Numerical Analysis, Research Report 81-02, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zürich, Switzerland, February, 1981.